

**In the district court of the United States
for the western district of Washington**

Lewis Vincent Hughes,)	
<i>in propria persona</i>)	In Law
15923 SE 369 th Street)	
Auburn, Washington [98092],)	Case No. 2:16-CV-00005-JCC
Tax Parcel ID 665250-0040 and)	
665250-0030)	Praecipe to Clerk of Court
Dean A. Arp,)	
<i>in propria persona</i>)	Re: Unalienable rights in the original
Plaintiff)	estate-
)	Article III; Constitution for the United
v.)	States of America
)	
WILLIAM RAYMOND HINESLY,)	Trial by Jury Demanded
William Raymond Hinesly, individual &)	
severally;)	
WEI YANG, Wei Yang, individually and)	
severally; DARIN SILVA, Darin Silva,)	
individually and severally; BETTER)	
PROPERTIES NW;)	
JOHN SCHLANBUSCH,)	
John Schlanbusch, individually and)	
severally;)	
JOHN S REALTY,)	
FIDELITY NATIONAL TITLE)	
COMPANY,)	
BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.,)	

MTC FINANACIAL INC. dba TRUSTEE)	
CORPS,)	
WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.,)	
John and Jane Doe 1-100,)	
Defendants)	

Writ of Praecipe
to the Clerk of Court

COMES NOW, Lewis Vincent Hughes, and directs this Writ of Praecipe to the Clerk of this honorable Court. On or about January 15, 2016, I received a communication from the Clerk of Court of the UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE, hereinafter U.S.D.C., which says that a case under Case No. **2:16-cv-00005-RSM** has been “*reassigned from Judge John C. Coughenour to Judge Ricardo S. Martinez.*”

Please be advised that the above mentioned case was not filed in the U.S.D.C., the case is filed in the district court of the United States for the western district of Washington and accordingly the filing fee was tendered for the case filed in the district court of the United States for the western district of Washington. Upon acceptance of the filing the Clerk appeared to note the Court which I have chosen as the forum to hear my Complaint. A demand hereby being made upon the Clerk of Court, show rule, order, or authority the above mentioned case has been apparently removed from the forum chosen, of the district court of the United States for the western district of Washington into the UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE. Please also be advised that no filing fee was tendered for the filing of any complaint in the UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE.

Therefor, you are hereby directed to remand my original filing under Case No. **2:16-cv-00005-RSM** to the district court of the United States for the western district of Washington and assign the case to an Article III Judge.

Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2076- Clerk of the United State district court:

“whoever, being a clerk of a district court of the United States, willfully refuses or neglects to make or forward any report, certificate, statement, or document as required by law, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.”

Also pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2071-Concealment, Removal, or mutilation generally:

(a) Whoever willfully and unlawfully conceals, removes, mutilates, obliterates, or destroys, or attempts to do so, or, with intent to do so takes and carries away any record, proceeding, map, book, paper, document, or other thing, filed or deposited with any clerk or officer of any court of the United States, or in any public office, or with any judicial or public officer of the United States, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

(b) Whoever, having the custody of any such record, proceeding, map, book, document, paper, or other thing, willfully and unlawfully conceals, removes, mutilates, obliterates, falsifies, or destroys the same, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both; and shall forfeit his office and be disqualified from holding any office under the United States. As used in this subsection, the term “office” does not include the office held by any person as a retired officer of the Armed Forces of the United States.

In addition, I am in receipt of an alleged “ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE” issued by Judge Ricardo S. Martinez of the U.S.D.C., depicts a non-existent case number. The case number on the face of the alleged ORDER does not show up on PACER. Furthermore, I do not currently have a case filed in the U.S.D.C. As previously mentioned, I filed a case into the district court of the United States for the western district of Washington, which is the only court in western washington which has been granted Article III judicial power by an Act of Congress., requiring of your office to assign the said case to an Article III Judge. Congress never abolished the the

district court of the United States for the western district of Washington. While Congress did in fact create the U.S.D.C. for the WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON, there is no place in the Congressional Record where Congress ever conferred Article III judicial power on this court. A certificate of search issued by the National Archivist has verified this fact.

Additionally, the “ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE” issued by Judge Ricardo S. Martinez does not have a seal of the court on it to validate its validity.

Wherefore, for the above reasons, I am returning the alleged “ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE” issued by Judge Ricardo S. Martinez in the U.S.D.C. marked “Refused for Cause, See Praeceptum to Clerk of Court.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Respectfully submitted this _____ day of February, 2016.

L.S. /s/ Lewis Vincent Hughes

L.S. /s/ Dean Arlo Arp

Refused for Cause
 See Praecipe to Clerk
 for Vincent Hughes
 Dean A. Arp P.P.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
 AT SEATTLE

LEWIS VINCENT HUGHES and DEAN)	
A. ARP,)	CASE NO. C16-00005RSM
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
v.)	
)	
WILLIAM RAYMOND HINESLY, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

Pro Se Plaintiff, Lewis Vincent Hughes filed a Complaint in this matter on January 4, 2016. Dkt. #1. On January 15, 2016, Mr. Hughes and Dean A. Arp, Plaintiffs, filed an Amended Complaint. Dkt. #3. Summons has not yet been issued.

Plaintiffs appear to raise allegations of harm related to a dispute over ownership of real property. *See id.*; Dkt. #1-1 (Civil Cover Sheet with “All Other Real Property” box checked under “Nature of Suit”). However, Plaintiffs’ Amended Complaint is difficult or impossible to follow due to repeated citations to far-fetched or historical but nonetheless inapplicable facts and law. For example, Plaintiffs argue that this action is in admiralty because “according to international law... [it] is beyond dispute and extends into antiquity: ‘Meanwhile those who seized wreck ashore without a grant from the Crown did so at their peril,’” citing to “Select